

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
AIKEN DIVISION

Corey A. Patterson Sr.,)	C/A No.: 1:14-717-JMC-SVH
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	
)	ORDER
)	
SCANA Corporation, d/b/a SCANA)	
Energy Georgia (SEGA) Aiken)	
Contact Center,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	


On February 27, 2014, Corey A. Patterson Sr. (“Plaintiff”), proceeding pro se, filed a complaint against SCANA Corporation (“Defendant”), alleging employment discrimination and retaliation. [Entry #1]. On April 23, 2014, Defendant filed a motion to dismiss Plaintiff’s complaint. [Entry #22]. As Plaintiff is proceeding pro se, the court entered an order on April 24, 2014, pursuant to *Roseboro v. Garrison*, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975), advising him of the importance of Defendant’s motion and of the need for him to file an adequate response. [Entry #24]. Plaintiff was specifically advised that if he failed to respond adequately, Defendant’s motion may be granted, thereby ending Plaintiff’s case.

Notwithstanding the specific warning and instructions set forth in the court’s *Roseboro* order, Plaintiff has failed to respond to the motion. As such, it appears to the court that he does not oppose the motion and wishes to abandon this action. Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff is directed to advise the court whether he wishes to continue with this

case and to file a response to Defendant's motion for summary judgment by June 18, 2014. Plaintiff is further advised that if he fails to respond, this action will be recommended for dismissal with prejudice for failure to prosecute. *See Davis v. Williams*, 588 F.2d 69, 70 (4th Cir. 1978); Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

June 4, 2014
Columbia, South Carolina



Shiva V. Hodges
United States Magistrate Judge